

REMARKS

1. For the purposes of the presented arguments and remarks, Patent '30 to McGrew is referred to as "McGrew", IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin Vol. 30(3), pp.1392-1393 (08/1987) is referred to as "IBM", Patent JP 08-039572 to Kataoka et al. is referred to as Kataoka, Patent '689 to Shvartsman is referred to as "Shvartsman", Patent '607 to De Graaf is referred to as "De Graaf", Patent '282 to Abraham is referred to as "Abraham", Patent "768 to Sassmannshausen et al. is referred to as "Sassmannshausen", Patent '736 to Mueller et al. is referred to as "Mueller", Patent EP 0766142 to Fan et al. is referred to as "Fan".

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-13, 15-19, 22-24, 26, 28-30 are pending in the application. Applicant cancels Claim 1 replaces it by new Claim 31. Applicant cancels Claim 29.

2. Claims 1-2, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC 130(a) over McGrew in view of IBM. Applicant cancels independent Claim 1 and introduces new independent Claim 31 directed to a seamless embossing surface. Applicant asserts that new claim 31 is patentable over McGrew in view of IBM. McGrew discloses an embossing surface with a pattern which was not profiled on that surface, but on a transition layer. No disclosure of a laser profiled polyimide embossing surface could be found in McGrew. No disclosure of interfering laser beams profiling the material of the embossing surface could be found in McGrew. No disclosure of a polyimide material in which the laser profiled data are wet developable could be found in IBM. McGrew in view of IBM does not provide any suggestion or motivation to profile and develop data on a polyimide material which becomes a seamless embossing surface. Allowance on new independent Claim 31 is therefore requested. Claims 2, 5 and 6 depend off new Claim 31 and are allowable.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-17, 22, and 28-29 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Shvartsman in view of McGrew, IBM and Kataoka. Claim 1 was canceled and replaced with new independent Claim 31. The arguments and reasons provided in paragraph 2 are repeated in their entirety with regard to this rejection. Since no disclosure of profiling data in a polyimide

material was found in either Shvartsman or Kataoka, new Claim 31 is not unpatentable over those publications and is allowable. Claims 2, 5-6 depend off allowable Claim 31 are allowable.

4. Applicant asserts that independent Claim 10 as amended is not obvious under 35 USC 103(a) over McGrew in view of IBM. In McGrew a data pattern is first formed in layer 16, which is a temporary layer that does not serve as a final embossing surface. Layer 16 of McGrew is later etched away while the data pattern is transferred onto another surface that becomes an embossing surface. Contrary to the embossing surface in McGrew, in the same polyimide profiled by the EMF radiation and containing the data is used as an embossing surface in accordance with amended Claim 10. Also, McGrew neither discloses nor suggests the use of the EMF radiation to profile data (such as a hologram) in the polyimide material. As follows from the description of FIG. 4 of McGrew (Col. 8, first paragraph), a transparent film 30 contains an already created master hologram. A beam of laser light merely transfers the master pattern from layer 30 onto layer 16. Since layer 16 in McGrew is not used as an ultimate embossing surface, combining McGrew with IBM does not render the present invention as claimed in amended Claim 10 obvious under 35 USC 103(a). Claims 11- 13, 15-19, 22-24 depend off now amended Claim 10 and are also allowable.

5. Similarly, Applicant asserts that independent Claim 28 as amended is patentable. Shvartsman describes only the use of radiation to harden the surface after the embossing patterns was created (Col. 9, line 3), and no mention of using the EMF radiation to profile the embossing surface to form a surface relief (data) or to develop the data after the relief was formed could be found in Shvartsman. No disclosure of how to prepare (cure) the embossing surface was found in Shvartsman either. In the IBM technical disclosure, the surface is developed by heat. Applicant's attorney studied a combination of Shvartsman, IBM and Kataoka, but was unable to find a suggestion or hint to combine the three publications to come up with the present invention as claimed in amended Claim 28. Therefore, Claim 28 as amended is now patentable.

6. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-19, 22, and 28-29 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Shvartsman in view of McGrew, IBM, Kataoka and in further view of JP 01-142077 and/or De

Graaf. Applicant respectfully repeats the arguments and reasons presented in paragraphs 2-5 and asserts that for those reasons amended Claim 10 and its dependent Claims 11-3, 15-19, and 22 are patentable and should be allowed. Similarly, for the same reasons new Claim 31 and its dependent Claims 2, 5, 6 8-9 are patentable and should be allowed.

7. Claims 1-6, 8-19, 22, 23, and 28-29 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Shvartsman in view of McGrew, IBM, Kataoka and in further view of JP 01-142077 and/or De Graaf and Abraham. Applicant respectfully repeats the arguments and reasons presented in paragraphs 2-5 and asserts that for those reasons amended Claim 10 and its dependent Claims 11-3, 15-19, and 22-23 are patentable and should be allowed. Similarly, for the same reasons new Claim 31 and its dependent Claims 2,4-6, 8-9 are patentable and should be allowed.

8. Claims 1-6, 10-17, 22, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over either Sassmannshausen or Mueller in view of Fan and McGrew. Applicant respectfully asserts that the cited publications contain no teaching or motivation to combine those references to come up with the present invention as claimed in amended independent Claim 10, and new Claim 31 or their dependent Claims. Amended Claim 30 is now dependent off patentable Claim 28 and is patentable.

9. With regard to Claim 26, Applicant respectfully points out that the Advisory Action of March 13, 2003 is ambiguous. Item 3 of the Advisory Action states that Applicant has overcome rejections over Claim 26. At the same time item 7 states that Claim 26 stands rejected. Clarification of the status of Claim 26 is respectfully requested. Applicant asks the examiner to telephone the undersigned Applicant's attorney to discuss the status of Claim 26.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending Claims. Applicant also respectfully asks the Examiner to telephone Applicant's attorney to discuss any questions arising out of consideration of the pending claims to expedite allowance.

Dated: July 16, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Maria Eliseeva

Maria M. Eliseeva, Reg. No. 43,328

Customer No. 29127

Houston Eliseeva LLP

4 Militia Drive, Ste. 4

Lexington, MA 02421

Tel: 781-863-9991

Fax: 781-863-9931